THE CURRENT LITERATURE ON SOCIAL STRATIFICATION CRITIQUE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

HAROLD W. PFAUTZ

Recent as well as past attempts at conceptualization have failed to produce any effective consensus as regards a frame of reference which might provide an unambiguous format for classifying the materials on social stratification. In addition, the convergence of the area of stratification with the traditional core of sociological interest—social structure and social change—makes it difficult to set up hard-and-fast lines of inclusion and exclusion. This summary, therefore, has been guided by two very general concerns. Paramount has been a desire to represent faithfully the broad scope of the field. Thus the topic headings have been devised in view of this purpose rather than any systematic set of concepts. Second, the subject of the survey and thus the basis for "pruning," is class, not caste, ethnic, or racial social stratification. These latter types, as well as such marginal subjects as "occupational prestige," "sociometric status," and so on, will be included only when the examples cited have some direct bearing on the problems of class stratification or when they illustrate the extent of the field. While a majority of the items cited come from sociology, materials in such other fields as history, political science, and psychology have also been included where they seem relevant.

The bibliography extends from 1945 to the present. The exceptions are a few items which, while published earlier, have only recently been translated and might be unfamiliar to those not thoroughly acquainted with the literature. Excluded are doctoral dissertations, book reviews (except where they are actually review articles), articles reprinted in anthologies which were published in original form before 1945, and studies of preliterate societies. The list is not to be considered complete: it comprises the literature to which the compiler had access.

The decision to limit the survey to the post–World War II period was informed by a number of considerations. In the first place, it is fair to assume that most of the materials which appeared earlier, especially the European classics, are more or less well known to the profession; second, Page,[2] as well as Gordon (123), have considered in detail the treatment of class stratification by the first generation of American sociologists. Further, there are already in existence a number of excellent bibliographies which cover the pre-1945 contributions: Bailey *et al.* (13), Cox (62), and Egbert *et al.* (92).[3] Finally, this venture in bibliography demonstrates the amazing amount of theoretical and empirical work which has been published since the end of the war.

The years 1945–52 represent, in some respects, the fruits of a period of germination which began as early as 1929 with the anthropological community studies of the Lynds, Warner, etc., and extended through the war years. This latter time symbolizes equally one of renaissance, in contrast to the neglect of social stratification by American sociologists since Ward, Sumner, and Cooley.[4]

[1] The writer wishes to thank Otis Dudley Duncan and Nelson N. Foote, of the University of Chicago, and Kurt Mayer, of Brown University, for their many helpful suggestions and Miss Barbara Hoiland for assistance in assembling the bibliography.

[2] Cf. Charles H. Page, *Class and American Sociology* (New York: Dial Press, 1940).

[3] Howard Brotz, under the auspices of the International Sociological Association, is currently engaged in the compilation of an annotated bibliography of recent studies of social stratification.

[4] Rough confirmation for these points is provided by the following observations: Ten items were found

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

The classification used in this paper is as follows:

I. Conceptualization and Theory
  A. Social Stratification
  B. Status and Class
II. Methodology
  A. Class Delineation and Placement
  B. Socioeconomic Status, etc.
  C. Methodological Studies
  D. Mobility
III. Empirically Oriented Studies
  A. Types of Units Stratified
  B. Dimensions of Class Analysis
IV. Critical Literature and Current Issues

I. CONCEPTUALIZATION AND THEORY

A. SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

Probably no area of current sociological interest suffers so much from the disease of overconceptualization. Merton's brief outline of some of the terms presently in use (225) offers some notion of it. Most writers are agreed that the general concept of social stratification involves the relative ordering of a population along some value hierarchy as distinguished from other divisions, such as by age and sex ("social differentiation"). It has been defined essentially as "a system of social inequality" by Kaufman (177), Kaufman *et al.* (180), MacIver (214), Marshall (220), and Sorokin (298). Gordon (124) speaks of "a vertical arrangement of persons —a hierarchy—a system of higher and lower, greater and lesser, superior and inferior." It is defined by Parsons (267) simply as "a ranking system" and as "a system of inclusion and exclusion" by McGuire (213); while Centers (46) sees it as "a descriptive ordering of people into high and low categories."

American sociologists, when they concern themselves at all with the problem of explaining, as opposed to describing, social stratification usually take a functional point of view. Davis and Moore (79) regard it as a functional necessity of all complex societies, serving to "place and motivate people" in the social structure. This position is also espoused by Kluckhohn (187), Parsons (266, 267), and Warner (314, 317) and it appears in many textbooks: e.g., Bennett and Tumin (19), Davis (78), and Williams (328). Social stratification thus becomes essentially an integrating structural attribute of social systems, and interclass relations are typically viewed as accommodative. It can be noted, in passing, that Cattell (34) points out the possible dysgenic function of the phenomenon.

Others, attacking the problem from a more dynamic point of view, consider the relationship between social stratification and social change. Moore (242) and Wormuth (330) raise the question of the conditions of class action; and Heberle (152) relates social stratification to political social movements. Adams' (3) remarks on the dynamics of class stratification are also relevant.

Types of stratification are usually conceptualized in terms of the basis of inequality—some form of status: power, prestige, or a combination of both. Another determinant is the structural nature of the strata. The traditional trichotomy of *class*, *estate* ("status group," "social order"), and *caste* is fairly ubiquitous in the literature.[5] In addition, there obviously exists the logical possibility of "mixed" types. And there is some evidence of an increasing interest in the phenomenon of *elites*. Representative discussions of the differences among these concepts

in the *American Journal of Sociology Index* under relevant headings for the period 1895–1935. Only nine items were added between 1935 and 1947. On the other hand, the *American Sociological Review Index* yielded a total of forty-four items, chosen on a similar basis, between 1936 and 1950. Cf. *American Journal of Sociology: Index to Volumes I–LII, 1895–1947* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948) and M. R. and H. M. Davie, *Index to the American Sociological Review: I–XV, 1936–1950* (New York: American Sociological Society, 1951).

[5] The classic origin of this trichotomy is, of course, Max Weber and other European theorists. Cf. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 180–95. Cf. also *Max Weber: The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 424–29.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

can be found in Davis and Moore (79), Cox (62, 63), Hatt (140), and von Wiese (327). Most introductory texts discuss at least the difference between class and caste types of stratification: e.g., Bennett and Tumin (19), MacIver and Page (216), and Ogburn and Nimkoff (260). The degree of mobility (or conversely, "closure"), seems to be the commonest basis of distinguishing among these terms, mobility being relatively greatest among classes and least among castes. Whereas classes are usually conceived of as involving a power hierarchy, either in the political and/or economic sense, status groups and castes are strata which are viewed as primarily oriented to a prestige hierarchy.

If there is some degree of consensus as to the definition of social stratification as a system of inequality, there is almost none on the question: Inequality with respect to what? And this brings up the topics of status, class in general, and social class in particular.

B. STATUS AND CLASS[6]

As noted above, the definitions of status and class are not unrelated to that of social stratification, for the latter *should* involve specification of the basis of inequality (some type of status), the structural characteristics of the strata (some type of "class"), as well as a theoretical rationale for stratification analysis. Much of the empirical research involves sheerly operational definitions of the two. However, there have been attempts at conceptualization apart from a direct concern with methodological procedures, and it is to this type of study which we now turn.

Among those who have attempted systematically to define types of class and status, a dichotomy seems to be the mode. MacIver and Page (216), as well as Heberle (152), distinguish between "economic" and "social" classes. Goldschmidt (120) identifies "occupational" and "social" classes. "Social" classes and "political" (economic), classes are distinctions made by Cox (62, 63). And Pfautz and Duncan (268) suggest "power" and "status" classes. Gordon (124), on the other hand, employs a fourfold classification: "social," "political," "economic," and "occupational" classes. In one analysis, Goldschmidt (119), attacking the problem on the basis of methodological as well as substantive criteria, differentiates among five different types.

The general tendency in the literature, however, is to deal only with the concept of *social* class and, in some instances, simply *class*. Unfortunately, the substantive content, the theoretical implications, and the methodological procedures involved are almost as extensive as the number of those who employ them. The range of meanings which are attached to these concepts is illustrated in the following sample of definitions.

For Centers (46) social classes are "internally cohesive" and "genuinely functional," "psycho-social groupings" which are ultimately anchored in the economic processes of society. They are conceived by him as "real" entities whose existence is to be tested by the criterion of class "identification." Williams (328) regards social classes as simply aggregates of individuals who have similar positions on a scale of prestige. A similar view is taken by Parsons (266), except that the kinship group becomes the constituent unit. Davis (78) also starts from the family, but social classes are groups rather than aggregates. Mendieta (224) sees social classes as unorganized aggregates of individuals whose character is determined by common economic situation and culture. Social classes are "group-conscious segments of the community" marked off in terms of prestige for MacIver and Page (216). Gordon (124) reserves the term social class for the "major status groups" in the community. For Moore (242) a social class is a group inclusive of age and sex differences, having a distinctive code, and to whom deference is given by other similar groups or

[6] For the sake of clarity "status" and "class" are employed here as *generic* terms. "Status," therefore, signifies simply *rank*, in the sense of relative position on any value hierarchy. "Class" refers merely to any type of *stratum*.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

from whom it is exacted. Heberle (152) sees social classes as consisting of people in economic classes ("collectivities of individuals with like economic position"), with like or similar opportunities for social life. Marshall (220) regards social classes as relatively permanent groups made up of families, involving relationships of inferiority and superiority, socially defined. The most considered attempt to delineate the boundaries of the concept of social class relative to the issues involved can be found in Sorokin (298), who defines it in terms of his own frame of reference.

For the most part, such local community studies as Hollingshead (163), Kaufman (178), Stendler (301), Warner (316, 317, 320), as well as Wheeler (325), produce operational definitions of social class. And it can also be observed in these instances that the status hierarchy is one of prestige, not of power. In addition, all the above consider classes as real groupings in the community and not simply heuristic devices. Finally, their research emphasizes the communal character of class and sees the classes essentially as participation groups with unique cultures. In this connection, Gordon (122) and Kluckholm (187) have suggested the use of the concept of "subculture."

Among the theorists who employ only the general term "class," Schumpeter (287) considers classes as consisting of more than mere aggregates. Rather, a class is aware of its own identity, and within it "intermarriage prevails . . . socially rather than legally." On the other hand, Wormuth (330), a political scientist, takes a more classic point of view, seeing class as an economic group whose members are psychologically and culturally linked, and which, under certain conditions, can take action in defense of itself.

Michels (228) concerns himself with "political" classes; and for Cox (62, 63), who takes a Marxian position, the term "social class" has only an ideological status. It is perhaps significant that Kaufman (177), in one formulation, eschews entirely the use of this concept and speaks only of social "strata"!

One term, in particular, has received much attention among those who have sought conceptual clarification: the middle class or middle class*es*. Cole (59) remarks on the difficulties of delineating its boundaries and his definition lists a dozen groups under the rubric. Other recent discussions of this important term can be found in Corey (61), Ferreira (99), and Crevenna (68). DeGre (81) sees its peculiarities and contradictions as springing from its middle position in the literal sense of the term. Mills (235, 238) and Croner (69) have dealt with the stratum considered to be the "new Middle Class," particularly the salaried professional and white-collar worker.

II. METHODOLOGY

Here, too, there prevails a minimum of consensus and a maximum of confusion. The possibilities of classifying the literature under this rubric are numerous and raise many questions. The methodological problems involved in the stratification of a functional social unit such as a local community are often quite different from those encountered in a study of the social class origins or status of some segment of it. It is also crucial that distinctions be made between the tasks of delineating the class structure of a community and that of placing individuals within it; between the correlates and the determinants of class status; and, finally, between class structures and assignments which are a function of the individual's self-conception, the researcher's analytic device, and the community's judgment.

A. CLASS DELINEATION AND PLACEMENT

The problem of marking off a social unit into a number of strata has been attacked in two generic ways. In most of the local community studies where the community's view is assumed to be determinant, participant observation and/or interviews with samples of long-time residents have been the basis for solving the problem of the number of classes in existence. This procedure is ex-

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

emplified in Stendler (301) and Warner (314, 315, 317, 320, 321). A consensus among raters where judges are employed is another device: e.g., Kaufman (178) and Hollingshead (163, 164). On the other hand, where some attribute such as occupation, or income or a questionnaire designed to get at class "identification" have been the methods of class delineation, the decision as to the number of classes has usually been arbitrary: cf. Anderson (8) and Centers (46). In any case, no consensus prevails as to the number of classes which exist in local communities, although there has been a traditional tendency to speak of upper, middle, and lower classes in the case of national societies. Loomis *et al.* (204) have suggested a sociometric test based on visiting as the answer to this problem in the local community, since this may produce "natural breaks."

The problem of class placement appears more often in the literature, since there are many more studies of segments of communities and societies than of total social units.

1. *External, objective approaches.*—By "external, objective approaches" the writer simply means those methods of assigning individuals in classes which employ attributes of individuals, selected primarily from the *analyst's* point of view. These, in turn, may involve a single criterion, or multiple criteria.

a) Single criterion.—As might be expected, the most popular single criterion of class placement is occupation. Usually some form of the Edwards census classification is employed, the breakdowns ranging on either side of the original sixfold division.[7] This method was used by Bendix (18), Berent (21), Bresard (27), Bultena (31), Doblin and Pohly (83), Dotson (85), Douglas (86), Geiger (113), Guttsman (132), Himmelweit *et al.* (158), Jenkins and Jones (172), Livi (202), Mueller and Mueller (246), Mulligan (250), Schuessler (285), and Sower (300).

[7] Cf. Alba M. Edwards, *A Social-economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938).

Rent was employed by Anderson (8) and by Mayer and Hauser (222). Hollingshead (162) used residential area, and Henriques (153) used color. Mack (218) has developed an index of social class using housing, only, although this is broken down into a number of subdivisions relative to condition, location, and similar considerations.

Many studies are concerned with but one or two classes rather than the entire range, and such types of research often lean on a single criterion in assigning individuals to their class. Cramer (67) used registration in a private school as an index of upper-class membership. Employment in domestic service, attendance of the children at public school, and appearance in the social register were criteria for identifying lower-, middle-, and upper-class persons, respectively, for Bossard and Boll (25). Residence in "a middle class suburb" and in "a highly restricted suburb" differentiated middle- from upper-class individuals for Hatt (138); while Hayner (150), in Mexico, used the presence of a telephone as an index of the upper-class, and children's attendance at kindergartens where free meals were served, of the lower.

b) Multiple criteria.—Probably the best-known multiple instrument for the assignment into social classes is Warner's "Index of Status Characteristics" (ISC) (315, 317, 320). It consists of a weighted score on four different items: occupation, house type, dwelling area, and source of income, each of which are rated by the analyst on a seven-point scale. Considered only a rough index of social class when employed without the correlative technique of "Evaluated Participation" (see below), it was employed by Warner in his early studies of Newburyport (319, 321) and in later studies of midwestern communities (316, 317, 333). His students and associates have used it in a variety of contexts in recent years. Drake and Cayton (87) presumably based their stratification of the Chicago Negro community on this instrument. Others have been Davis and Havighurst (74, 75, 76), Havighurst *et al.* (145, 146), Havighurst and Russel (147),

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

Havighurst and Breese (144), Janke and Havighurst (171), Neugarten (256), Schulman and Havighurst (286), Vogt (312), and Weckler (322).

A number of modifications have been made in the original instrument when applied to areas outside that in which it was developed. Aberle and Naegele (1) used an adaptation of the ISC, plus subjective impressions of their sample members, as a basis for class placement. Brown (30) included data on participation and statements of community members as adjuncts to class location. Duvall (90) substituted "education and literary interests" and "personal appearance" for "source of income" and "dwelling area" in an urban study. Modifications were also made by Ericson (94), when confronted with an urban situation. While Hill and McCall (156) employed the device without change, they suggested adaptations of the ISC as necessary in particular culture areas. The so-called "McGuire-Loeb" version appears in McGuire (212) and was the basis for Roth and Peck's study (278). A scale based only on "house type" and "occupation"—plus an impressionistic rating of family reputation —was the method used by MacDonald *et al.* (210) to place their individuals into social classes. Murray (253) has adapted the ISC for use with Negroes; and Albrecht (5) has developed an "Index of Life-Time Status," which substituted "ethnicity" and "religious affiliation" for "dwelling area" and "house type" in cities. The particularistic qualities of "dwelling area" and "house type," as indexes of prestige, as well as the cost of investigating them, would seem, at this point, to disqualify them for urban studies. Modifications were also made by Eells *et al.* (91), which involved the assignment of a sample of residents in a city of 100,000.

Other examples of the use of multiple criteria for assigning class positions include Klatskin (185), who employed residence, occupation, and education, combined into a single score and converted into a scale. Mills (235) used occupation and income, as did Komarovsky (190). A weighted score from nine different items characterized the class-placement procedure of Ruesch *et al.* (281). Finally, one aspect of Centers' (46) study involved the construction of a "stratification index" which combined occupation, wealth, and power status into a single score.

2. *Internal, objective approaches.*—These are methods of class placement which employ a ranking device based on standards derived from the *community:* an individual is placed in the class to which the members of the community assign him. The research worker enlists a representative panel of local experts to do the ranking. By exploratory interviewing and trial ranking period, the analyst endeavors to discover the values which are the basis of local prestige, or lack of it, and on the basis of the discovered criteria the judges are instructed to rank individuals. Thus Hollingshead (160, 163, 164) instructed his judges to rate on the basis of "the way the family lived," "income and possessions," "participation in community affairs," and "prestige and standing in the community." The result is a composite judgment which often involves several types of status. Other studies employing the ranking approach are Kaufman (178), Loomis and Powell (205), Oyler (264), Powell (270), and Stendler (301).

Warner's procedure known as "Evaluated Participation" (EP) (314, 315, 317, 320), which places individuals in the class structure from the community's point of view, is basically a variation of the ranking method. It consists of the content analysis of indirect interviews and other types of materials by a variety of complementary methods designated as "the method of matched agreements," "simple assignment," "comparison," "status reputation," and "symbolic placement." In addition, there is an interviewer check list and rating sheet for the ranking of members in cliques and institutions, the relationship of which to the EP procedure has yet to be made clear. This method is regarded as the most valid approach, not only to the problem of class placement, but especially, in the case of the

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

method of matched agreements, to the delineation of the class structure of a community. A procedure for converting ISC scores into their "social class equivalents" is described by Warner in detail in his methodological study (317). EP has not been applied in many situations apart from those in which it was developed. Hill and McCall (156) used it in their study of a small southern community but have yet to publish data on their findings on the relationship between ISC and EP in this context. EP has obvious limitations when it comes to large populations; and where attempts have been made to convert ISC scores into social class equivalents in such situations, the analysts have been forced to rely for their EP data on interviews from small samples. Such work is admittedly open to question where the notion of "social class" as defined by Warner is concerned.

3. *Subjective approaches.*—"Subjective approaches" involve those methods of placing individuals in a social class hierarchy which refers to their own conception of their class—a matter of self-affiliation. The best-known example is, of course, Centers (36, 44, 46, 48), who, using a questionnaire, requested his respondents to choose among upper class, middle class, working class, and lower class. This method, which grew out of public opinion research, has been employed by the polling organizations themselves from time to time (cf. Cantril [32]). It was also used by Sims (293) in a study of undergraduate class "identification." A more recent development along these lines is Sims's (291) "Social Class Identification Scale" (SCI), which purports to get at an individual's "unconscious class affiliation." This instrument was employed by Sims in a study of the social class affiliations of a group of public-school teachers (292). Hammond (135) used a questionnaire which, unlike Centers', allowed room for more nondirected responses, in addition to an occupational breakdown.

As a matter of fact, much recent research has taken advantage of the proliferation of techniques and combined two or more of the basic methods in a single study. Benney and Geiss (20) used an occupational scale, an identification question, and an interviewer rating.[8] Birch and Campbell (22) employed occupation and an interviewer rating. A ten-item social status score, an analysis of reputation among peers, and clique behavior, in addition to a judges' rating, are found in Cook's study (60). Duncan and Artis (88) employed raters, Sewell's socioeconomic status scale, a "community prestige score," and an identification question, as well as such single criteria as occupation, income, formal office-holding, and education. Occupational data and judgments of researchers were the basis for social class placement in Eysenck (95). Hawthorn and Hawthorn (149) employed a ranking method, an analysis of clique behavior, and a number of external criteria of status in their study. Three different methods—interviewer ratings, ranking by others, and associational activity—were used by Jones (174). And Wheeler (325), in his study of a local community, devised a social status scale based on external, objective criteria in addition to the use of judges. Such analyses, along with Warner's ISC and EP, provide data for comparative methodological studies of the various procedures, an area which will be noted following a consideration of research which investigates only "status" differences without using the more abstract concept of class.

B. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, ETC.

Many research workers have avoided the problems connected with the term "class" and dealt only with that of status, conceived in terms of a continuum. Others, when concerned with status-related attributes (e.g., occupation), discuss their findings simply in terms of whatever index has been used. Such studies are felt to be relevant

[8] The interviewer's judgment of the social class of respondents is frought with obvious defects. While it does not appear to any extent in the American literature, English students seem to have found it useful. And at least one study, Silberman and Spice (290), relies entirely on this technique!

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

here to the extent that some kind of inequality is a central issue.

The most prevalent concept in this literature is that of "socioeconomic status." Other terms which are found include "socioeconomic level," "social level," "occupational status," "occupational level," etc. As in the case of class oriented research, both single and multiple criteria have been used. And, similarly, when it comes to studies employing a single criterion of status, occupation again takes the lead. Occupation as a measure of socioeconomic status was used by Anastasi and Miller (7), Centers (37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 51), Clark (55, 56, 57), Daric (70), Dinkel (82), Form (103), and Schneider (284).

Multiple criteria have also figured in the measurement of socioeconomic status differentials. Kaiser and Whelpton (184) employed an eight-item index based on income, rent, occupation, education, Chapin's Scale, net worth, and purchase price of automobile. Nye (59) used five items—occupation, estimated income, church affiliation, memberships in associations, and working status of mother—to yield an index of "socioeconomic level." Income, occupation, homeownership, and rent were the basis of Gilmore's and Wilson's study of Negro socioeconomic status (114). Stewart and Chambers (302), as well as Sykes (303), employed income, occupation, and education to get at status differentials. Sims's Score Cards were the basis of Smith's study (297). Gough's "St Scale" (125, 126, 127) uses a personality test to discover status differences, a novel development.

C. METHODOLOGICAL STUDIES

The recent increase in the number of empirical studies of social stratification manifests a concern not only to test the reliability and validity of particular procedures but also to pursue comparative studies of them. To date, Warner's ISC and EP have received the most attention.

As noted above, Warner found the predictive relationship between these two measures extremely high (317). Hollingshead (163) found a close agreement between the results of his ranking method and Warner's EP for an identical sample in "Elmtown" ("Jonesville"). The relationship between the ISC and Sims's "American Home Scale" has been studied by Finch and Hochn (100). Centers (49, 50), in his attempt to equate his questionnaire ("subjective") method with Warner's "objective" ISC, considered his results to be positive. Finally, Loomis *et al.* (204) proposed sociometric tests for validating Warner's results with respect to class delineation.

Gough (126, 127) has analyzed the relationship between his "St Scale" to a variety of objective criteria of status with some positive results. Similarly, Sims (294) has studied the relationship between his new SCI and his old objective scale of socioeconomic status. The Sewell socioeconomic status scale has been restandardized by Belcher (17). Knupfer (188) has investigated in a comparative fashion a number of indexes of socioeconomic status. And Harris and Staab (136) found a significant relationship between income and socioeconomic status, although it was not sufficiently high for predictive purposes. Duncan and Artis (89), after a comparative analysis of a variety of methods of measuring socioeconomic status and stratification, concluded that none of the present techniques provides a final answer. As far as predictions or other variables from indexes of stratification are concerned, they maintain that economic status is as efficient as any, where prestige status is at stake. More recently Lenski (195) has raised a serious question as to the existence of distinct prestige classes in local communities. His results tended, rather, to suggest merely a continuum of status differences. Under the rubric of methodology, Michael's suggestion of the use of class concepts (conceived in subcultural terms) in the analysis and design of public opinion research can also be noted (227).

A marginal area in connection with the methodology of social stratification is occupational status research. Recent studies of the relative prestige of various occupations

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

include Davies (71), Deeg and Patterson (80), Hall and Jones (134), Tuckman (308), and Welch (323). The general conclusion from these efforts and from an NORC poll (255) is that a high degree of consensus exists on the part of various publics as to the relative standing of occupations. On the other hand, Form (103) reported less satisfactory results. The problem is probably more complex than is generally assumed if the studies of Lipset and Bendix (197, 198) and Miller and Form (229) are taken into account. Their results raise a question as to the validity of *present* occupational status as a permanent measure of status because of the instability of career patterns. Occupation as an index of status has also appeared less simple to Hatt (139), who distinguished between "status" (the vertical dimension) and "situs" (the horizontal dimension) in an effort to produce more valid rankings, and applied scaling procedures. North and Hatt (257), on the basis of a questionnaire, found that the primary criteria for high rank among their judges were the amount of training and the degree of responsibility for public welfare involved in an occupation. A brief review of occupational prestige research can be found in Lastrucci (194).

D. MOBILITY

Mobility, a crucial aspect of social stratification, has been almost entirely neglected in the community studies published to date. The usual procedure involves relating father's occupation to son's occupation and often reduces the matter to the study of "social origins." Examples include Adams (4), Geiger (111), Guttsman (132), Jenkins and Jones (172), Miller (232), and Wance and Butler (313). A summary of English studies can be found in Floud (101), and an excellent critical review of American studies is Rogoff's (274).

Variations and refinements in the basic technique for discovering the amount and kind of mobility have appeared in a number of recent studies. Hsu (167), using district historical records, employed the concepts of "prominence" and "continuity" in a study of social mobility in China. Albrecht (5) developed a concept of "Life-Time Status" and an operational notion of "status point changes" in measuring individual mobility. In studies of the mobility of large numbers of individuals some type of expected or ideal distribution has been used as a bench mark against which to measure actual changes or from which to deduce them. This was the method of Rogoff (273), who used a ratio of actual to expected recruitment proportions to measure variation in the social origins of occupational strata through time. McGuire (213) employed net reproduction rates in order to extrapolate to an expected distribution of social classes. And on this basis, by a process of deduction, he arrived at a crude notion of the amount of mobility. Ruesch *et al.* (281) developed a technique for measuring social mobility among individuals from case data, using the concept of "criterion classes."

III. EMPIRICALLY ORIENTED STUDIES

While not all the items cited below are empirical in the sense that they involve the collection of a body of data in support of whatever hypotheses are at stake, all, nevertheless, are directed toward an understanding of some empirical situation.

A. TYPES OF UNITS STRATIFIED

1. *National societies and regions.*—Studies aimed at the stratification of large social units are obviously few in number, owing to the cost and other inherent difficulties. A few, however, have been made. Cantril (32) and Centers (36, 46) provide materials on social class "identification" in America in terms of an arbitrary four-class frame of reference. They used a national cross-section of white males. Centers has also reported on the social class identification of American females (39) and of adolescents (48). More discursive treatments of the national society include Sorokin (299) and MacIver (214), the latter observing a shift in the basis of stratification from property to skill. Of course many textbooks concern themselves

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

with the class structure of the nation: e.g., Bennett and Tumin (19), MacIver and Page (216), and Williams (328). Traditionally a trichotomy is discussed: upper, middle, and lower classes.

Essentially discursive studies of the hierarchy of classes in other countries (which usually do not indicate the exact proportions involved) include Little (201) on Africa; Becker (15) on Germany; Carreno (33) on Mexico; Henriques (153) on Jamaica; Fei (98) on China; Inkeles (170) on Soviet Russia; Rosenfeld (276) on Israel, and Tomasic (306) on Balkan society. Discursive English studies include those of Montague (240) and Owen (262). A survey of current and projected research on social class in England can be found in Montague (241). Hutton's study of caste in India (169) should be mentioned here.

Among those works on the stratification of national societies in eras other than the present are Lowie's analysis of pre-1914 German (207); Mathew's study of Caroline England (221); and von Wiese's work on capitalist societies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (327).

Studies of particular strata of national societies include those of Corey (61), Meadows (223), and Mills (238) on the American "new middle classes." In addition, there is Owsley's study of the ante bellum southern middle class (263). Lewis and Angus (196) and Cole (59) have considered the nature and function of the English middle classes; and the middle classes in Latin-American countries are the topic of Crevenna (68). Finally, Croner (69) has recently completed a study of the Swedish white-collar stratum; and Thrupp (305) has made a historical study of the merchant class in medieval London.

2. *Local communities.*—There are, apparently, no recent attempts to map the social class structure of metropolitan centers of over 100,000; the early studies of Charles Booth and the related re-study of London remain the only ones on record.[9] A few studies have been made of what are termed "middle-sized cities" (i.e., of between 25,000 and 100,000). Geiger's recently published and as yet untranslated research on a Danish city of 100,000, which was based on occupational census data, comes under this rubric (113). So, too, do the studies of Hawthorn and Hawthorn (149) on a Latin-American city of 30,000; and Hayner's analysis of a Mexican town of similar size (150). In each case the class structure is described as upper, middle, and lower.

Studies of small towns and rural hamlets, obviously because they are easier to make are the commonest. Warner and his associates have described the social class structure in a New England town of 17,000 population (321), finding six classes: upper-upper, lower-upper, upper-middle, lower-middle, upper-lower, and lower-lower. They have recently published materials on a smaller midwestern town of 6,000 where they found five classes (the upper-upper class is absent), (316, 317). Hollingshead (163, 164) also found five classes in the same town by his rating method. Hill and McCall (156) have studied a southern town of 8,000 and used a five-class breakdown. Stendler (301) found four classes in her study of a New England community of 15,000. Mills (235) used a fivefold classification in a city of 60,000 from sample data. Five classes were also indicated in Rockford, Illinois (333), a city of about 100,000.

Analyses of essentially rural communities in this country have been made by Duncan and Artis (88); Goldschmidt (119)—two classes; Kaufman (178)—five classes; Oyler (264); Rubin (279)—five classes; Vogt (312)—three classes; West (324)—four classes; and Wheeler (325)—seven classes. The study of a planned government "Greenbelt" town by Form (104) may also be included in this category.

A number of Negro communities have also been stratified. Drake and Cayton (87) saw the Chicago Black Belt community as

[9] Cf. Charles Booth *et al.*, *Life and Labour of the People in London* (17 vols.; London: Macmillan & Co., 1902–4). Booth found eight classes in terms of such criteria as "number of servants," "crowding," "income," etc.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

composed of upper, middle, and lower classes. Hill and McCall (156) employed the ISC in a small southern town and arrived at a five-class structure; while Jones (174), in a Virginia study, noted the absence of a Negro middle class, finding only upper and lower strata. A review of Negro community studies can be found in Boskoff (23) as well as in Hill (155).

Falardeau (97) has investigated two French-Canadian villages. Loomis and Powell (205) and Powell (270) found, in a study of two communities in Costa Rica, a four-class structure in one and a three-class structure in another. Five income classes were used by Longmore in an analysis of a small Peruvian community (203). A threefold class structure was employed in Mukherjee's studies of six Indian villages (247, 248).

Institutional and "micro-stratification" are marginal to our subject. However, examples of this type of work include Form's study of social strata in housing projects (105); Cook's analysis of a high-school class (60); and Silberman and Spice's research on Liverpool schools (290). Others are Gardner (109) and Warner and Low (319), who studied the status structure of the factory; and Whyte (326), who described the restaurant as a social system in which status stratification occurs. Gold's consideration of the relations between janitors and tenants (117), and Becker's analysis of teacher-pupil relationships in terms of social class (16) are also relevant.

An empirical study of ethnic stratification is exemplified by Warner and Srole (321). Studies of the caste type of stratification are illustrated by Tumin's analysis of a Guatemalan peasant community (309, 310) and Davis' of Negro-white relations in a southern town (72).

B. DIMENSIONS OF CLASS ANALYSIS

1. *Life-chances.*—Since social stratification has been generally defined as a system of inequality, the concept of *life-chances* assumes a central position. The large number of studies which can be placed in this category testify to its strategic place, in documenting not only the facts of inequality but also relative to the conditions of class action. Significant class and/or status differences have been empirically demonstrated with respect to a variety of phenomena. Daric (70) in France, Douglas (86) in England, and Mayer and Hauser (222) in the United States have observed an inverse relationship between social status and mortality. On the basis of occupational data, Clark (55, 56, 57) noted a negative correlation between social status and various types of psychoses in the city of Chicago. Ruesch *et al.* (281) found a disproportionate number of cases of delayed recovery among lower-class patients. And Ruesch (280), on the basis of a theory of differential repression as a concomitant of class-specific cultures, posits a tendency for middle-class individuals to be prone to psychosomatic affects, for upper-class individuals to be prone to psychoneuroses of the manic-depressive type, and for lower-class individuals to suffer disproportionately from traumatic and structural difficulties.

One of the most often demonstrated local effects of the class structure is as a barrier to intimate social intercourse. In the local community a relatively endogamous situation tends to exist classwise (cf. Brown [30], Centers [42], and Hollingshead [160, 162]). The community studies cited above (e.g., Warner, West), invariably document this fact, as well as the class-confined character of "clique behavior." Sower (300), however, reported no relationship between social stratification and student association in a suburban study.

Numerous studies have also related the class and status differences to educational opportunity. Illustrative of this research are Anderson (8), Mueller (246), Mulligan (250), and Stewart and Chambers (302). Not only do the chances of getting an education vary directly with social class and status but significant differences have been found within the school. Smith (297) demonstrated a differential in extra-curricular activities; Cook (60) noted status differences in popularity; and Silberman and Spice

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

(290) observed a class effect on personal reputation. Other considerations of the general relationship between social stratification and education can be found in Abrahamson (2), Frazier (109), Johnson (174), and Murray (251).

Recently, the question of social class differences has been raised with respect to performance on standard intelligence tests. The existence of a middle-class bias (as well as the possibilities of differentials in scholastic motivation) has been considered at length by the following: Davis and Havighurst (75), Davis (73), Davis and Hess (77), Eells *et al.* (91), Havighurst and Breese (144), Janke and Havighurst (171), and Schulman and Havighurst (286). Murray (252, 254) has investigated the problem among Negro children.

Class differences in fertility have been recognized for some time. Among the recent studies can be mentioned those of Dinkel (82) and Kiser and Whelpton (184). It has also been suggested that lower-class individuals have less chance of achieving a stable marriage (Hollingshead [161] and Roth and Peck [278]); that class differences exist as regards family reactions to crisis (Koos [191]); and that adolescent-parent adjustment varies with socioeconomic level (Nye [259]).

Veteran adjustment has also been related by Havighurst *et al.* (145) to class status. The chances of fame have long been known to be positively related to social origins (Schneider [284]). Havighurst and Russel (147) have found that promotion in the armed services varied with respect to social class differences. Even community knowledge (Sykes [303]) seems to vary directly with occupation, income, and education.

2. *Class consciousness.*—The hypothesis that there is a predictive relationship between objective position in a status order and subjective perspective (particularly with respect to politicoeconomic preferences) is the crux of dynamic stratification analysis. While the tendency of some of the recent studies to confine the concept of class to terms of participation and prestige not only has by-passed this dimension but also has redefined it as a matter of purely "social" class awareness (i.e., snobbery), the fact remains that in its classic formulation the theoretic value of class consciousness stems from its relationship to the conditions of class action. Class consciousness in the sense of a collective awareness of political and economic interests now becomes the topic for review rather than "social" class awareness. Studies of this latter variety are, however, illustrated by Himmelweit *et al.* (158) and Stendler (301), who investigated this type of perception among children.

Centers (36, 38, 39, 44, 46, 48) has investigated the relationship between social class "identification" and politicoeconomic perspective as indicated by an attitude test designed to reveal "conservatism-radicalism." He concludes that there is a degree of class consciousness in America but that it provides only nascent possibilities for class action. Recently, Hammond (135) has attacked the problem in a more sophisticated manner on the basis of a small sample of males in Melbourne, Australia. Mills (235, 238), in his study of the so-called "new middle classes," found them to be characterized by a lack of organization for political action and an ideology originating in the "old" middle classes. On the other hand, he suggested not only that the extremes of the American class structure are organized into associations capable of expressing class interests but also that the ideologies of the polar strata spring more or less directly from their class position. Other studies of this problem are Almond (6), who investigated the political attitudes of wealthy individuals on the basis of historical case materials, and Saenger (283), who found a positive relationship between social status and voting behavior in a New York City sample. More discursive treatments of this topic can be found in Corey (61), Cox (65), and Moore (243, 244).

Recent English investigations of the relationship between class and/or status differences and political behavior are Benney and Geiss (20), Brich and Campbell (22), and

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

Briggs (28). Eysenck (95), employing the concept of "primary attitudes," found that working-class subjects tended to be more "conservative" and "tough-minded" than middle-class subjects, political affiliation being held constant. In this context might also be mentioned Wunderlich's analysis of the relation between Fascist political preference and middle-class status in Germany (332).

3. *Mobility.*—Closely related to the concepts of life-chances and class consciousness as facets of class analysis is that of *mobility.* The term is used to refer not only to individual mobility and mobility between generations but also to the phenomenon of group mobility. American studies of mobility include Adams (4), who found a greater rate of mobility into the legal profession in the West, and Albrecht (5), who discovered a tendency to upward mobility in a middle- and upper-class sample, in contrast to a downward trend in the life-experience of lower-class respondents, in a study of urban older people. The occupational mobility of samples of urban males has been investigated by Centers (46) and Rogoff (273). Lipset and Bendix (198), in a West Coast sample, find that much occupational mobility involves the situs rather than the status dimension. Wance and Butler (313) observed a tendency among miners' sons to leave mining and become skilled workers in the face of technological changes. Anderson *et al.* (9) have preliminary data indicating a significant relationship between intelligence and occupational mobility. Centers (40) and Mulligan (249) have discussed education as a channel of social mobility in this country. Miller's work on the recruitment of the American business elite (232) is also pertinent.

More discursive treatments of the topic of social mobility in the United States are Havighurst (141), who posits a decrease in mobility motivation; Hertzler (154), who reviews the evidence of increasing rigidity in the American class structure; and Sjoberg (295), who concludes that American social classes are, at present, *not* becoming more rigid. McGuire (213), incidentally, estimated 20 per cent of the population as mobile. Bennett and Tumin (19) see estate tendencies in our social structure, while such texts as Ogburn and Nimkoff (260) and Williams (328) are noncommittal in the face of conflicting evidence.

Studies of social mobility in Italy and China have been made by Livi (202) and Hsu (167), respectively. Inkeles (170) considers the phenomenon in Soviet Russia, and Floud (101) reviews the situation in England. The study by Jenkins and Jones (172) on the social class origins of Cambridge University alumni reports democratic trends.

4. *Life-style.*—The concept of *life-style* implies that social classes are also distinguished by cultural differences. Indeed, to the extent that classes are defined as group (as opposed to aggregate or mass) phenomenon, it logically follows that they must develop "cultures." And this aspect of stratification analysis has, perhaps, received more attention than any other by American sociologists—who even go to the extent of suggesting culture as a "definition" of class (cf. Gordon [122]). It might be observed, in passing, however, that, while the cultural correlates of class and/or status can connote invidious distinctions, they are relevant to explain social stratification.

The majority of local community studies present a great amount of data documenting differential life-styles among the strata discovered. The following are illustrative: Goldschmidt (120), Hollingshead (163, 164), Rubin (279), Stendler (301), Warner (316, 317, 321), West (324), and Wheeler (325). Mills (238) has described in detail the culture of the white-collar and salaried professional strata of the middle class. Finally, Drake and Cayton (87) produce considerable materials on the different life-styles of urban Negro social classes. Kluckhohn and Kluckhohn (186), incidentally, see the American middle class as the carrier of the "core" culture in distinction to the lower class.

A great variety of culture traits have been linked with class and/or status in more

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

limited researches. Differences in methods of child training have been observed by Davis and Havighurst (74, 76), Ericson (94), and Klatskin (185). Davis and Havighurst, as well as Ericson, found rigidity emphasized in the middle class, and permissiveness in the lower class. Duvall (90) reported conceptions of parental role in the middle class as emphasizing "development," while in the lower classes more "traditional" notions prevailed. Bossard and Boll (24) studied the debutante culture in the urban upper class. They also (25) noted differences with respect to "family ritual." McGuire (211) and Maas (209) contributed to the knowledge of class differences in home life, while Kephart (181) observed class differences in funerals, Havighurst (142), in family life education and Motz (245), in conceptions of the marital roles.

Class differences in the leisure activities of children have been investigated by Cramer (67) and MacDonald *et al.* (210). Dollard (84) has summarized the materials on class differences in drinking mores, and Lynes gives an impressionistic account (208) of the cultures of "highbrows, middlebrows and lowbrows."

Anastasi and Miller (7) found differences in preferred personality traits linked to status differences in a sample of adolescents. Scheussler (285) has recently studied the relationship between social class and variations in musical taste. Kinsey's studies connect wide variations in sexual behavior with differences in occupational and educational status (183).

Dotson (85) and Komarovsky (190) linked differences in associational activity with class; and, in particular, the lack of formal associational activity is shown to be characteristic of the lower and working classes even in cities. Kaufman (179) has studied the same phenomenon in a rural community. Bultena (31), Hoult (166), and Pope (269) have indicated a relationship between social class and denominational preferences. The phenomenon of status symbols has been discussed systematically by Goffman (116) and investigated empirically by Hatch and Hatch (137) as well as Minton (239).

5. *Attitudes and personality structure.*—This dimension of stratification analysis might logically be considered simply as the "subjective aspect" of life-style. It involves the influence of class and/or status differences on attitudes and personality—apart from the concept of class consciousness. When the concept of class as culture is stressed, this type of research comes to the fore. It has recently been considered in a general fashion by Havighurst (143) and Havighurst and Taba (148). In the former article, Havighurst offers the concept of "modal" as opposed to "basic" personality type as the more valid. Rosenberg (275) has proposed that significant differences in "emotionality" exist between the personality structure of middle- and working-class individuals. He hypothesizes that middle-class individuals are more repressed. Mills (234) has also considered the impact of the culture of the "new middle classes" on its members, epitomizing the product as the "competitive personality." A tendency for middle-class culture to produce neurotic tendencies in male children has been posited by Green (130). Some of the attitudinal correlates of lower-class membership have been sketched by Knupfer (188). And Warner and Henry (318), in their analysis of the radio daytime serial, have suggested some of the psychological needs of the lower-middle-class female.

The psychological strains attendant on social climbing and the acquisition of status symbols have been considered by Ruesch (283), Ruesch *et al.* (282), Oppenheimer (261), and Bossard and Sanger (26). The impact of class membership and status on the wishes and goals of Negro students has been documented by Smith (296) and on the occupational aspirations of children by Galler (108) as well as Himmelweit *et al.* (158). Centers (51) concluded that safety and security as opposed to self-expression were typical of lower-class motivation. Form (103) and Centers (37) have investigated the relationship between occupational status

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

and attitudes. Data and hypotheses relating class and status differences to the phenomenon of prejudice can be found in Centers (37, 41), in Kardiner and Ovesey (176), and in Hatt (138). Aberle and Naegele (1) have considered class-related fathers' attitudes toward children. In the majority of these studies the findings remain on the strictly empirical level and are seldom placed in any theoretical frame of reference. Kluckhohn (187), however, has suggested some abstract dimensions of Weltanschauungen which might provide a more systematic basis for research.

6. *Elites.*—A number of recent studies are oriented to the type of stratum termed an *elite.* Implied in this concept is the idea of relatively small numbers of individuals having a monopoly of the power of decision with respect to the content and distribution of various types of values.[10]

Political elites have been generally considered by Michels (227), Mannheim (219), and Aron (11, 12). Studies of the English political elite have been made by Clayton (58) and by Guttsman (132), both of whom report democratic trends in recruitment. North (258) has studied the Chinese Communist elite. The social origins of the Nazi elite was the topic of Doblin and Pohly's analysis (83). The place of the elite in the stratification structure of contemporary Israel has been investigated by Eisenstadt (93). And the Danish intelligentsia has been the subject of Geiger's recent investigations (110, 111).

The American business elite has been considered by Miller (231, 232) and Mills (233). Mills (236, 237) has also studied the American labor elite. Bendix (18) could find no support for positing an elite among American civil servants in a small sample study. Merton's analysis of the role of the intellectual in the public bureaucracy is pertinent (226). Lasswell *et al.* (193) contains a bibliography on political elites.

[10] Cf. Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction* (London: Kegan Paul, 1940), trans. Edward Shils. Mannheim speaks of "the political, the organizing, the intellectual, the artistic, the moral, and the religious" types of elites (pp. 82–83).

IV. CRITICAL LITERATURE AND CURRENT ISSUES

Another result of the proliferation of stratification studies has been the appearance of a fairly voluminous critical literature. Some of it has been directed at specific empirical studies, but much of it has raised leading questions concerning social stratification theory and research in general.

Warner and his associates have been taken to task with respect to (*a*) their limitation of the concept of social class to prestige differences and consequent neglect of the power aspect of status; (*b*) their tendency to reify their concept of class; (*c*) the validity of their generalizations beyond the local community situation; (*d*) the reliability of their techniques and representativeness of their samples; and (*e*) the ideological aspects of their conceptual apparatus and practical conclusions. Such criticisms appear in Brooks (29), Centers (41, 46), Chinoy (54), Goldschmidt (118, 120), Gross (131), Hatt (140), Heberle (152), Lipset and Bendix (199, 200), Miller (230), Pfautz and Duncan (268), and Sorokin (298).

Centers' results, methods, and conceptualizations have been critically reviewed by Chinoy (54), Eysenck (96), Goldschmidt (119), and Gross (131). The basic issue is the adequacy of Centers' research operations to the hypotheses and concepts which inform his studies. Recent criticisms of the classic Marxian position with respect to the nature and function of class stratification can be found in Geiger (112), Moore (252), Parsons (274), and Wright (331). Mention might also be made at this point of Floud's recent critical appraisal of Geiger's analysis of social stratification in a large Danish city (102).

One of the most important current issues is the theoretical rationale of social stratification theory and research. Lipset and Bendix (200), Kaufman *et al.* (180), and others, have noted the difference between static description as over against prediction and

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

explanation as the purpose of stratification analysis.

A variety of crucial questions revolve, of course, about the conceptions of status and class. The work of Duncan and Artis (89), Kaufman *et al.* (180), Lipset and Bendix (199), and Shils (289) has brought about increasing recognition of the multidimensional character of status. The necessity of specifying the content of this concept in research and the need for empirical attacks on the relationship among economic power, political power, and prestige have only recently been brought to the fore. In this connection Hollingshead *et al.* (165) as well as Kaufman *et al.* (180) have insisted on distinguishing between the criteria of status and class (in the sense of the values which are actually at stake in empirical rank orders) and the operational indexes which are employed by analysts for purposes of description.

Gross (131), among others, has raised the question as to the logical character of the concept of class; that is, whether it is a "substantive" or a "classificatory" term. This question as to whether class refers to empirically existing groups or is simply an heuristic device has also been considered by Kaufman *et al.* (180) as well as by Lipset and Bendix (200).

The question of whether the class structure is to be seen as a function of local community values or of the mass society is another issue, raised by Duncan and Artis (89), Hatt (140), Kluckhohn (187), Pfautz and Duncan (268), and others. Recently, Hatt (140) has attempted to sketch the peculiar difficulties which attach to the study of "community status" in urban and metropolitan situations.

From a methodological point of view, the present discussion centers on the question as to the relative values of "objective" and "subjective" class delineation and placement. This has been discussed by Hollingshead *et al.* (165), Kaufman *et al.* (180), and Kornhauser (192). Certainly there is no guaranty that the results of either method (plus, it might be added, the possibility that the analytic instrument itself might operate as a third variable) will produce similar results in the same situation. Suffice it to observe that the choice devolves upon the purpose of the investigation, there being nothing intrinsically correct about either. And, apart from the choice made by the analyst as regards his basic approach, there obviously exist many technical issues with respect to the application of the relevant instruments: ranking procedures, multiple criteria indexes, questionnaires, and so on.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of this admittedly cursory review of the literature, what can be said in conclusion with respect to the trends that have characterized social stratification studies in the period under review? The *raison d'être* for the majority of the empirical studies has been primarily descriptive, merely to note the facts of social inequality. In addition, there has also been much interest in documenting the impact of social stratification on individuals and groups within societies as opposed to society as a whole. The situation here parallels that of public opinion research. Few empirical efforts aim at validating a theory of social stratification in the sense either of relating the phenomenon to social systems generally or of explaining the development, maintenance, and modification of structures per se.

In the conceptualizations of status and class there has been an obvious preoccupation with prestige to the neglect of power. Further, the general tendency to employ multidimensional conceptions of status and ambiguous notions of the structural characteristics of class strata have prevented, at least until recently, the posing of strategic questions. This seems to be largely a product of what Floud (107) has cogently observed as "an attempt to separate the study of stratification in contemporary society from its historical context in Marxian notions of the class structure." The unprofitableness of this ostrich-like policy is rapidly becoming apparent.

From a methodological point of view, the

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

failure to cast research in a hypothetical mold has resulted, in many instances, in a species of operationalism that often fails to meet even the limited goals of this type of endeavor in an unambiguous fashion. And the ubiquity of Warner's methods—in spite of the many cogent and, as yet unanswered, criticisms—is evidence of this discouraging trend.

Finally, however, it can be fairly stated that, in spite of the lack of consensus which has been reported regarding the theories, methods, and results of empirical studies (in addition to the barrage of criticisms which have been leveled at these materials), at least two promising notes are struck. On the one hand, the period 1945–52 can perhaps be interpreted as experimental from the perspective of both methods and concepts. And, on the other, the tendency in the most recent contributions has been precisely to clarify the theoretical and methodological issues which have been precipitated by the materials. It is to be hoped that these two trends will converge to provide designs for productive research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ABERLE, D. F., and NAEGELE, K. D. "Middle-Class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitudes toward Children," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, XXII (1952), 366–78.
2. ABRAHAMSON, STEPHEN. "Our Status System and Scholastic Rewards," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXV (1952), 441–50.
3. ADAMS, STUART. "Fact and Myth in Social Class Theory," *Ohio Journal of Science*, LI (1951), 313–19.
4. ———. "Regional Differences in Vertical Mobility in a High-Status Occupation," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 228–35.
5. ALBRECHT, RUTH. "Social Class in Old Age," *Social Forces*, XXIX (1951), 400–405.
6. ALMOND, GABRIEL. "The Political Attitudes of Wealth," *Journal of Politics*, VII (1945), 213–55.
7. ANASTASI, ANNE, and MILLER, SHIRLEY. "Adolescent 'Prestige Factors' in Relation to Scholastic and Socio-economic Variables," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXIX (1949), 43–50.
8. ANDERSON, C. ARNOLD. "Social Class Differentials in the Schooling of Youth within the Regions and Community-Size Groups of the United States," *Social Forces*, XXV (1947), 434–40.
9. ANDERSON, C. ARNOLD; BROWN, JAMES C.; and BOWMAN, MARY JEAN. "Intelligence and Occupational Mobility," *Journal of Political Economy*, LX (1952), 218–39.
10. ANDERSON, W. A. "Family Social Participation and Social Status Self-ratings," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 253–58.
11. ARON, RAYMOND. "Social Structure and the Ruling Class. I," *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 1–16.
12. ———. "Social Structure and the Ruling Class. II," *ibid.*, pp. 126–43.
13. BAILEY, W. C.; FOOTE, N.; HATT, P. K.; HESS, R.; MORRIS, R. T.; SEEMAN, M.; and SYKES, G. "Bibliography on Status and Stratification." New York: Social Science Research Council, 1952. (Mimeographed.)
14. BAUDLER, LUCILLE, and PATTERSON, D. G. "Social Status of Women's Occupations," *Occupations*, XXVI (1947–48), 421–24.
15. BECKER, HOWARD. "Changes in the Social Stratification of Contemporary Germany," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 333–42.
16. BECKER, HOWARD S. "Social Class Variations in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXV (1952), 451–65.
17. BELCHER, JOHN C. "Evaluation and Restandardization of Sewell's Socio-economic Scale," *Rural Sociology*, XVI (1951), 246–55.
18. BENDIX, REINHARD. *Higher Civil Servants in American Society*. ("University of Colorado Studies, Series in Sociology," No. 2.) Boulder, Colo.: University of Colorado Press, 1949.
19. BENNETT, JOHN W., and TUMIN, MELVIN M. *Social Life*, pp. 127–37, 452–92, 570–600. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
20. BENNEY, MARK, and GEISS, PHYLLIS. "Social Class and Politics in Greenwich," *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 310–27.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

21. BERENT, J. "Fertility and Social Mobility," *Population Studies*, V (1952), 244–60.
22. BIRCH, A. H., and CAMPBELL, PETER. "Voting Behaviour in a Lancashire Constituency," *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 197–208.
23. BOSKOFF, ALVIN. "Negro Class Structure and the Technicways," *Social Forces*, XXIX (1950), 124–31.
24. BOSSARD, J. H. S., and BOLL, ELEANOR S. "Rite of Passage—a Contemporary Study," *Social Forces*, XXVI (1948), 247–55.
25. ———. "Ritual in Family Living," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 463–69.
26. BOSSARD, J. H. S., and SANGER, W. P. "Social Mobility and the Child: A Case Study," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLIV (1949), 266–71.
27. BRESARD, JEAN. "Mobilité sociale et dimension de la famille," *Population*, V (1950), 533–66.
28. BRIGGS, ASA. "Social Structure and Politics in Birmingham and Lyons" (1825–1848), *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 67–80.
29. BROOKS, M. R. "American Class and Caste: An Appraisal," *Social Forces*, XXV (1946), 207–11.
30. BROWN, JAMES STEPHEN. "Social Class, Intermarriage, and Church Membership in a Kentucky Community," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (1951), 232–42.
31. BULTENA, LOUIS. "Church Membership and Church Attendance in Madison, Wisconsin," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 384–89.
32. CANTRIL, HADLEY (ed.). *Public Opinion, 1935–1946*, pp. 116–17. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1951.
33. CARRENO, ALBERTO MARIA. "Las Classes sociales de Mexico," *Revista mexicana de sociologia*, XII (1950), 333–50.
34. CATTELL, RAYMOND B. "The Cultural Functions of Social Stratification: I. Regarding the Genetic Bases of Society," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXI (1945), 3–23.
35. ———. "The Cultural Functions of Social Stratification: II. Regarding Individual and Group Dynamics," *ibid.*, pp. 25–55.
36. CENTERS, RICHARD. "The American Class Structure: A Psychological Analysis," in *Readings in Social Psychology*, ed. T. M. NEWCOMB and E. L. HARTLEY, pp. 481–93. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1947.
37. ———. "Attitude and Belief in Relation to Occupational Stratification," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXVII (1948), 159–85.
38. ———. "Children of the New Deal: Social Stratification and Adolescent Attitudes," *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, IV (1950), 315–35.
39. ———. "Class Consciousness of the American Woman," *ibid.*, III (1949), 399–408.
40. ———. "Education and Occupational Mobility," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 143–44.
41. ———. "Four Studies in Psychology and Social Status," *Psychological Bulletin*, XLVII (1950), 263–71. (Review article.)
42. ———. "Marital Selection and Occupational Strata," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV (1949), 530–35.
43. ———. "Motivational Aspects of Occupational Stratification," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXVIII (1948), 187–217.
44. ———. "Nominal Variation and Class Identification: The Working and the Laboring Classes," *ibid.*, XLV (1950), 195–215.
45. ———. "Occupational Mobility of Urban Occupational Strata," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 197–203.
46. ———. *The Psychology of Social Classes.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949.
47. ———. "A Reply," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 623–25.
48. ———. "Social Class Identifications of American Youth," *Journal of Personality*, XVIII (1950), 292–302.
49. ———. "Toward an Articulation of Two Approaches to Social Class Phenomena: I. Similarities and Differences in Theoretical Formulation, Method and Results," *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, IV (1950), 499–514.
50. ———. "Toward an Articulation of Two Approaches to Social Class Phenomena: II. The Index of Status Characteristics and Class Identification," *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, V (1951), 159–78.
51. CENTERS, RICHARD, and CANTRIL, HADLEY. "Income Satisfaction and Income

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

Aspiration," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLI (1946), 64–69.
52. CHARTIER, BARBARA. "The Social Role of the Literary Elite," *Social Forces*, XXIX (1950), 179–186.
53. CHEN, TA. "Basic Problems of the Chinese Working Classes," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIII (1947), 184–91.
54. CHINOY, ELY. "Research in Class Structure," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XVI (1950), 255–63. (Review article.)
55. CLARK, ROBERT E. "Psychoses, Income, and Occupational Prestige," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV (1949), 433–40.
56. ———. "The Relationship of Alcoholic Psychoses Commitment Rates to Occupational Income and Occupational Prestige," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 539–43.
57. ———. "The Relationship of Schizophrenia to Occupational Income and Occupational Prestige," *ibid.*, XIII (1948), 325–30.
58. CLAYTON, L. W. "The British Administrative Class," *Personnel Administration*, XIV, No. 4 (1951), 41–45, 57.
59. COLE, G. D. H. "The Conception of the Middle Classes," *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 275–90.
60. COOK, LLOYD A. "An Experimental Sociographic Study of a Stratified Tenth-Grade Class," *American Sociological Review*, X (1945), 250–61.
61. COREY, LEWIS. "Problems of the Peace: The Middle Class, Old and New," *Antioch Review*, V (1945), 68–87.
62. COX, OLIVER C. *Caste, Class, and Race*. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1948.
63. ———. "Estates, Social Classes, and Political Classes," *American Sociological Review*, X (1945), 464–69.
64. ———. "Max Weber on Social Stratification: A Critique," *ibid.*, XV (1950), 223–27.
65. ———. "Modern Democracy and the Class Struggle," *Journal of Negro Education*, XVI (1947), 155–64.
66. ———. "Race and Caste: A Distinction," *American Journal of Sociology*, L (1945), 360–68.
67. CRAMER, M. WARD. "Leisure Time Activities of Economically Privileged Children," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXXIV (1949–50), 444–50.
68. CREVENNA, THEO. R. (ed.). *Materiales para el estudio de la clase media en la América Latina*, Vols. I–V. Washington, D.C.: Publicaciones de la oficina de ciencias sociales, 1950.
69. CRONER, FRITZ. *Tjänstemannaka ren i det moderna samhället*. Stockholm: Gebers, 1952. (English translation in process.)
70. DARIC, JEAN. "Mortality, Occupation, and Socio-economic Status," *Vital Statistics—Special Reports*, XXXIII (September 21, 1951), pp. 175–87.
71. DAVIES, A. F. "Prestige of Occupations," *British Journal of Sociology*, III (1952), 134–47.
72. DAVIS, ALLISON. "Caste, Economy, and Violence," *American Journal of Sociology*, LI (1945), 7–15.
73. ———. *Social-Class Influences upon Learning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.
74. DAVIS, ALLISON, and HAVIGHURST, ROBERT J. *Father of the Man*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.
75. ———. "The Measurement of Mental Systems (Can Intelligence Be Measured?)," *Scientific Monthly*, LXVI (1948), 301–16.
76. ———. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 698–710.
77. DAVIS, ALLISON, and HESS, ROBERT D. "What About I.Q.'s?" *National Education Association Journal*, XXXVIII (1949), 604–5.
78. DAVIS, KINGSLEY. *Human Society*, pp. 364–91. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949.
79. DAVIS, KINGSLEY, and MOORE, W. E. "Some Principles of Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, X (1945), 242–49.
80. DEEG, M. E., and PATERSON, D. G. "Changes in Social Status of Occupations," *Occupations*, XXV (1947), 205–8.
81. DEGRE, GERARD, "Ideology and Class Consciousness in the Middle Class," *Social Forces*, XXIX (1950), 173–79.
82. DINKEL, ROBERT M. "Occupation and Fertility in the United States," *American Sociological Review*, XVII (1952), 178–83.
83. DOBLIN, E. M., and POHLY, C. "The Social Composition of the Nazi Leadership," *American Journal of Sociology*, LI (1945), 42–49.
84. DOLLARD, JOHN. "Drinking Mores of the Social Classes," in *Alcohol, Science and So-*

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

ciety, pp. 95–104. New Haven: Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1945.
85. DOTSON, FLOYD. "Patterns of Voluntary Association among Urban Working-Class Families," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (1951), 687–93.
86. DOUGLAS, J. W. B. "Social Class Differences in Health and Survival during the First Two Years of Life: The Results of a National Survey," *Population Studies*, V (1951), 35–58.
87. DRAKE, ST. CLAIR, and CAYTON, HORACE R. *Black Metropolis*, pp. 495–715. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1945.
88. DUNCAN, OTIS DUDLEY, and ARTIS, J. W. *Social Stratification in a Pennsylvania Rural Community*. (Agricultural Experiment Station Bull. 543.) State College, Pa.: Pennsylvania State College School of Agriculture, 1951.
89. ———. "Some Problems of Stratification Research," *Rural Sociology*, XVI (1951), 17–29.
90. DUVALL, EVELYN MILLIS. "Conceptions of Parenthood," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII (1946), 193–203.
91. EELLS, K.; DAVIS, A.; HAVIGHURST, R. J.; HERRICK, V. E.; and TYLER, R. W. *Intelligence and Cultural Differences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
92. EGBERT, DONALD DREW; PERSONS, STOW; and BASSETT, T. D. S. *Socialism and American Life*, Vol. II: *Bibliography, Descriptive and Critical*, pp. 343–418. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.
93. EISENSTADT, S. N. "The Place of Elites and Primary Groups in the Absorption of New Immigrants in Israel," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (1951), 222–31.
94. ERICSON, MARTHA C. "Child-rearing and Social Status," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII (1946), 190–92.
95. EYSENCK, H. J. "Primary Social Attitudes as Related to Social Class and Political Party," *British Journal of Sociology*, II (1951), 198–209.
96. ———. "Social Attitude and Social Class," *ibid.*, I (1950), 56–66. (Review article.)
97. FALARDEAU, J. C. "Stratifications sociales de notre milieu," *Royal Society of Canada: Proceedings and Transactions*, XXXVIII (1945), 65–71.
98. FEI, HSIAO-TUNG. "Peasantry and Gentry: An Interpretation of Chinese Social Structure and Its Changes," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII (1946), 1–17.
99. FERREIRA, J. V. "The Middle Class," *Sociological Bulletin* (India), I (1952), 60–70.
100. FINCH, F. H., and HOECHN, A. J. "Measuring Socio-economic or Cultural Status: A Comparison of Methods," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXXIII (1951), 51–67.
101. FLOUD, JEAN. "Educational Opportunity and Social Mobility," *Year Book of Education, 1950*, pp. 117–35.
102. ———. "Social Stratification in Denmark," *British Journal of Sociology*, III (1952), 173–77. (Review article.)
103. FORM, WILLIAM H. "Toward an Occupational Social Psychology," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXIV (1946), 85–99.
104. ———. "Status Stratification in a Planned Community," *American Sociological Review*, X (1945), 605–13.
105. ———. "Stratification in Low and Middle Income Housing Areas," *Journal of Social Issues*, VII (1951), 109–31.
106. FORM, WILLIAM H., and MILLER, DELBERT C. "A Note on 'Occupational Mobility of Urban Occupational Strata' by Richard Centers," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 622–23.
107. FRAZIER, ALEXANDER, "Shall We Teach the Status System?" *School Review*, LV (1947), 93–98.
108. GALLER, ENID H. "Influence of Social Class on Children's Choices of Occupation," *Elementary School Journal*, LI (1951), 439–45.
109. GARDNER, BURLEIGH B. "The Factory as a Social System," in *Industry and Society*, ed. WILLIAM FOOTE WHYTE, pp. 4–20. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1946.
110. GEIGER, THEODOR. *Aufgaben und Stellung der Intelligenz in der Gesellschaft*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1949.
111. ———. "An Historical Study of the Origins and Structure of the Danish Intelligentsia," *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 209–20.
112. ———. *Die Klassengelschaft im Schmelztiegal*. Copenhagen, 1949.
113. ———. *Soziale Umschichtungen in einer Danischen Mittelstadt*. ("Acta Jutlandica, Social Science Series," No. 23.) Copenhagen: University of Aarhus, 1951.
114. GILMORE, H. W., and WILSON, LOGAN. "Negro Socioeconomic Status in a South-

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

ern City," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXIX (1945), 361–73.

115. GLASS, D. V. (ed.). *Social Mobility in Britain*. (Forthcoming.)
116. GOFFMAN, ERVING. "Symbols of Class Status," *British Journal of Sociology*, II (1951). 294–304.
117. GOLD, RAY. "Janitors versus Tenants: A Status-Income Dilemma," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (1952), 486–93.
118. GOLDSCHMIDT, WALTER R. "America's Social Classes: Is Equality a Myth?" *Commentary*, X (1950), 175–81.
119. ———. "Social Class in America—a Critical Review," *American Anthropologist*, LII (1950), 483–98. (Review article.)
120. ———. *As You Sow*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1947.
121. GORDON, MILTON M. "The Concept of the Sub-culture and Its Application," *Social Forces*, XXVI (1947), 40–42.
122. ———. "*Kitty Foyle* and the Concept of Class as Culture," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIII (1947), 210–17.
123. ———. "Social Class in American Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology*, LV (1949), 262–68.
124. ———. *A System of Social Class Analysis*. ("Drew University Studies," No. 2.) Madison, N.J.: Drew University Bulletin, 1951.
125. GOUGH, HARRISON G. "A New Dimension of Status. I. Development of a Personality Scale," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 401–9.
126. ———. "A New Dimension of Status. II. Relationship of the St Scale to Other Variables," *ibid.*, pp. 534–37.
127. ———. "A New Dimension of Status. III. Discrepancies between the St Scale and 'Objective' Status," *ibid.*, XIV (1949), 275–81.
128. ——— "Relationship of Socio economic Status to Personality Inventory and Achievement Test Scores," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVII (1946), 527–40.
129. ———. "A Short Social Status Inventory," *ibid.*, XL (1949), 52–56.
130. GREEN, ARNOLD W. "The Middle-Class Male Child and Neurosis," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 31–41.
131. GROSS, LLEWELLYN, "The Use of Class Concepts in Sociological Research," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV (1949), 409–21.
132. GUTTSMAN, W. L. "The Changing Social Structure of the British Political Elite, 1886–1935," *British Journal of Sociology*, II (1951), 122–34.
133. HAGGARD, ERNEST A., *et al.* "Intelligence Tests: Some Effects of Practice, Motivation, and the Presentation of Test Items on the Performance of Upper-Class and Lower-Class Children," *Psychological Monographs*. (Forthcoming.)
134. HALL, JOHN, and JONES, D. CARADOG, "Social Grading of Occupations," *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 31–55.
135. HAMMOND, S. B. "Stratification in an Australian City," in *Readings in Social Psychology*, ed. GUY E. SWANSON, T. M. NEWCOMB, and E. L. HARTLEY, pp. 288–99. Rev. ed. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952.
136. HARRIS, MARY J., and STAAB, JOSEPHINE. "The Relationship of Current Net Income to the Socioeconomic Status of Southern Farm Families," *Rural Sociology*, XVI (1951), 353–58.
137. HATCH, D. L. and M. A. "Criteria of Social Status as Derived from Marriage Announcements in the *New York Times*," *American Sociological Review*, XII (1947), 396–403.
138. HATT, PAUL K. "Class and Ethnic Attitudes," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 36–43.
139. ———. "Occupation and Social Stratification," *American Journal of Sociology*, LV (1950), 533–43.
140. ———. "Stratification in the Mass Society," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 216–222.
141. HAVIGHURST, R. J. "The Influence of Recent Social Changes on the Desire for Mobility in the United States," in *Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture*, ed. LYMAN BRYSON, LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, and R. M. MACIVER, pp. 97–105. New York: Harper & Bros., 1947.
142. ———. "Social Class Differences and Family Life Education at the Secondary School Level," *Marriage and Family Living*, XII (1950), 133–35.
143. ———. "Social Class and Basic Personality Structure," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXXVI (1952), 355–63.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

144. HAVIGHURST, R. J., and BREESE, FAY H. "The Relation between Ability and Social Status in a Midwestern Community. III. Primary Mental Abilities," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVIII (1947), 241–47.
145. HAVIGHURST, R. J.; EATON, W. H.; BAUGHMAN, J. W.; and BURGESS, E. W. *The American Veteran Back Home*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951.
146. HAVIGHURST, R. J., and RODGERS, ROBERT R. "The Role of Motivation in Attendance at Post-High School Educational Institutions," in *Who Should Go to College* by Byron S. Hollinshead. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
147. HAVIGHURST, R. J., and RUSSEL, MARY. "Promotion in the Armed Services in Relation to School Attainment and Social Status," *School Review*, LIII (1945), 202–11.
148. HAVIGHURST, R. J., and TABA, HILDA. *Adolescent Character and Personality*, pp. 13–22, 31–35. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.
149. HAWTHORN, H. B. and A. E. "Stratification in a Latin American City," *Social Forces*, XXVII (1948), 19–29.
150. HAYNER, N. S. "Differential Social Change in a Mexican Town," *Social Forces*, XXVI (1948), 381–90.
151. HEBERLE, RUDOLF. "Observations on the Sociology of Social Movements," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 346–357.
152. ———. *Social Movements*, pp. 143–91. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
153. HENRIQUES, FERNANDO. "Colour Values in Jamaican Society," *British Journal of Sociology*, II (1951), 115–21.
154. HERTZLER, J. O. "Some Tendencies toward a Closed Class System in the United States," *Social Forces*, XXX (1952), 313–23.
155. HILL, MOZELL C. "A Comparative Analysis of the Social Organization of the All-Negro Society in Oklahoma," *Social Forces*, XXV (1946), 70–77.
156. HILL, MOZELL C., and MCCALL, B. C. "Social Stratification in 'Georgia Town,'" *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 721–29.
157. HILL, MOZELL C., and WHITING, A. N. "Some Theoretical and Methodological Problems in Community Studies," *Social Forces*, XXIX (1950), 117–24.
158. HIMMELWEIT, H. T.; HALSEY, A. H.; and OPPENHEIM, A. N. "The Views of Adolescents on Some Aspects of the Social Class Structure," *British Journal of Sociology*, III (1952), 148–72.
159. HOCART, A. M. *Caste: A Comparative Study*. London: Methuen & Co., 1950.
160. HOLLINGSHEAD, A. B. "Class and Kinship in a Middle Western Community," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 469–75.
161. ———. "Class Differences in Family Stability," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXXII (1950), 39–46.
162. ———. "Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 619–27.
163. ———. *Elmtown's Youth: The Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.
164. ———. "Selected Characteristics of Classes in a Middle Western Community," *American Sociological Review*, XII (1947), 385–95.
165. HOLLINGSHEAD, A. B., *et al.* "Community Research: Development and Present Condition," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 136–56.
166. HOULT, THOMAS F. "Economic Class Consciousness in American Protestantism," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 97–100.
167. HSU, FRANCIS L. K. "Social Mobility in China," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 764–71.
168. HUMPHREY, N. D. "Race, Caste, and Class in Colombia," *Phylon*, XIII (1952), 161–66.
169. HUTTON, J. H. *Caste in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1946.
170. INKELES, ALEX. "Social Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union: 1940–1950," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 465–79.
171. JANKE, L. L., and HAVIGHURST, R. J. "Relations between Ability and Social Status in a Midwestern Community. II. 16-Year-Old Boys and Girls," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVI (1945), 499–509.
172. JENKINS, HESTER, and JONES, D. CARADOG. "Social Class of Cambridge Univer-

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

sity Alumni of the 18th and 19th Centuries," *British Journal of Sociology*, I (1950), 93–116.

173. JOHNSON, E. S. "Social Classes as Fact and Perspective in the Social Sciences," *School Review*, LX (1952), 203–12.
174. JONES, C. R. "Social Stratification in a Negro Population: A Study of Social Class in South Boston, Va.," *Journal of Negro Education*, XV (1946), 4–12.
175. JOUSSAIN, ANDRÉ. *Les Classes sociales*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1949.
176. KARDINER, ABRAM, and OVESEY, LIONEL. *The Mark of Oppression*, pp. 82–157. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1951.
177. KAUFMAN, HAROLD F. "An Approach to the Study of Urban Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, XVII (1952), 430–37.
178. ———. *Defining Prestige in a Rural Community*. ("Sociometry Monographs," No. 10.) New York: Beacon House, 1946. Cf. also "Members of a Rural Community as Judges of Prestige Rank," *Sociometry*, IX (1946), 71–85.
179. ———. *Participation in Organized Activities in Selected Kentucky Localities* (Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station Bull. 528.) Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1949.
180. KAUFMAN, H. F.; DUNCAN, O. D.; GROSS, N.; and SEWELL, W. "Problems of Theory and Research in the Study of Social Stratification in Rural Society." (Forthcoming.)
181. KEPHART, WILLIAM M. "Status after Death," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 635–43.
182. KING, C. WENDELL. "Social Cleavage in a New England Community," *Social Forces*, XXIV (1945–46), 322–27.
183. KINSEY, ALFRED C.; POMEROY, W. B.; and MARTIN, C. E. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, pp. 327–93. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1948.
184. KISER, C. V., and WHELPTON, P. K. "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility: IX. Fertility Planning and Fertility Rates by Socio-economic Status," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, XXVII (1949), 188–244.
185. KLATSKIN, E. H. "Shifts in Child Care Practices in Three Social Classes under an Infant Care Program of Flexible Methodology," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*," XXII (1952), 52–61.
186. KLUCKHOHN, CLYDE and FLORENCE R. "American Culture: Generalized Orientations and Class Patterns," in *Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture*, ed. LYMAN BRYSON, LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, and R. M. MACIVER, pp. 106–28. New York: Harper & Bros., 1947.
187. KLUCKHOHN, FLORENCE R. "Dominant and Substitute Profiles of Cultural Orientations: Their Significance for the Analysis of Social Stratification," *Social Forces*, XXVIII (1950), 376–93.
188. KNUPFER, G. *Indices of Socio-economic Status: A Study of Some Problems of Measurement*. New York: Genevieve Knupfer, 1946.
189. ———. "Portrait of the Underdog," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XI (1947), 103–14.
190. KOMAROVSKY, MIRRA. "The Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 686–98.
191. KOOS, EARL L. "Class Differences in Family Reactions to Crisis," *Marriage and Family Living*, XII (1950), 77–78, 99.
192. KORNHAUSER, ARTHUR. "Public Opinion and Social Class," *American Journal of Sociology*, LV (1950), 333–45.
193. LASSWELL, H. D.; LERNER, D.; and ROTHWELL, C. E. *The Comparative Study of Elites: An Introduction and Bibliography*. ("Hoover Institute Studies, Ser. B: Elites," No. 1.) Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1952.
194. LASTRUCCI, C. L. "The Status and Significance of Occupational Research," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 78–84.
195. LENSKI, GERHARD E. "American Social Classes: Statistical Strata or Social Groups?" *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII (1952), 139–44.
196. LEWIS, ROY, and MAUDE, ANGUS. *The English Middle Classes*. London: Phoenix House, 1949.
197. LIPSET, S. M., and BENDIX, R. "Social Mobility and Occupational Career Patterns. I. Stability of Jobholding," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (1952), 366–74.
198. ———. "Social Mobility and Occupational Career Patterns. II. Social Mobility," *ibid.*, pp. 494–504.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

199. ———. "Social Status and Social Structure. I," *British Journal of Sociology*, II (1951), 150–68.
200. ———. "Social Status and Social Structure, II," *ibid.*, pp. 230–54.
201. LITTLE, K. L. "Social Change and Social Class in the Sierra Leone Protectorate," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV (1948), 10–21.
202. LIVI, LIVIO. "Sur la mesure de la mobilité sociale: Résultats d'un sondage effectué sur la population italienne," *Population*, V (1950), 65–76.
203. LONGMORE, T. WILSON. "A Matrix Approach to the Analysis of Rank and Status in a Community in Peru," *Sociometry*, XI (1948), 192–206.
204. LOOMIS, C. P.; BEEGLE, J. A.; and LONGMORE, T. W. "Critique of Class as Related to Social Stratification," *Sociometry*, X (1947), 319–37. Cf. also "Sociometry Monographs," No. 19. New York: Beacon House, 1948.
205. LOOMIS, C. P., and POWELL, REED M. "Sociometric Analysis of Class Status in Rural Costa Rica," *Sociometry*, XII (1949), 144–57.
206. LOOMIS, C. P., and PROCTOR, CHARLES. "The Relationship between Choice Status and Economic Status in Social Systems," *Sociometry*, XII (1950), 307–13.
207. LOWIE, R. H. *The German People*, pp. 55–102. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1945.
208. LYNES, RUSSELL. "Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow," *Harper's Magazine*, CXCVIII (February, 1949), 19–28.
209. MAAS, HENRY. "Some Social Class Differences in the Family Systems and Group Relations of Pre- and Early Adolescents," *Child Development*, XXII (1951), 145–52.
210. MACDONALD, M.; MCGUIRE, C.; and HAVIGHURST, R. J. "Leisure Activities and the Socioeconomic Status of Children," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV (1949), 505–19.
211. MCGUIRE, CARSON. "Family Life in Lower and Middle Class Homes," *Marriage and Family Living*, XIV (1952), 1–6.
212. ———. "Social Status, Peer Status, and Social Mobility" (memorandum for the Committee on Human Development), supplement to *Social Class in America*. Chicago: Committee on Human Development, 1949.
213. ———. "Social Stratification and Mobility Patterns," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 195–204.
214. MACIVER, R. M. "The New Social Stratification," in *Our Emergent Civilization*, ed. R. N. ANSHEN, pp. 103–22. New York: Harper & Bros., 1947.
215. ———. *The Web of Government*, pp. 114–25. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947.
216. MACIVER, R. M., and PAGE, CHARLES H. *Society: An Introductory Analysis*, pp. 348–83. New York: Rinehart & Co., 1949.
217. MCMILLAN, ROBERT T. *A Study of Farms in Oklahoma by Size and Economic Class*. (Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station Bull. B-330.) Stillwater: Oklahoma A. and M. College, 1949.
218. MACK, RAYMOND W., "Housing as an Index of Social Class," *Social Forces*, XXIX (1951), 391–400.
219. MANNHEIM, KARL. *Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning*, pp. 77–107. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.
220. MARSHALL, T. H. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950.
221. MATHEW, DAVID. *The Social Structure in Caroline England*. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
222. MAYER, A. J., and HAUSER, P. M. "Class Differentials in Expectation of Life at Birth," *Revue de l'Institut Internationale de Statistique*, XVIII (1950), 197–200.
223. MEADOWS, PAUL. "Facts and Figures on the White Collar Worker," *Technological Review*, LI (1949), 508–10, 522–28.
224. MENDIETA Y NUÑEZ, LUCIO. "The Social Classes," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 166–76.
225. MERTON, R. K. "The Provisional Concept of Interpersonal Influence (Addenda Remarks)," in *Communications Research—1948–1949*, ed. P. F. LAZARSFELD and F. N. STANTON, pp. 215–19. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949.
226. ———. "The Role of the Intellectual in Public Bureaucracy," *Social Forces*, XXIII (1945), 404–15.
227. MICHAEL, DONALD N. "The Use of Cultural Concepts in the Functional Analysis of Public Opinion," *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, V (1951), 407–15.
228. MICHELS, ROBERTO. *Roberto Michels' First Lectures in Political Sociology*, trans.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

ALFRED DE GRAZIA. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

229. MILLER, D., and FORM, WILLIAM H. "Measuring Patterns of Occupational Security," *Sociometry*, X (1947), 362–75.
230. MILLER, S. M. "Social Class and the 'Typical' American Community," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 294–95.
231. MILLER, WILLIAM. "American Historians and the Business Elite," *Journal of Economic History*, IX (1949), 184–208.
232. ———. "The Recruitment of the American Business Elite," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, LXIV (1950), 242–53.
233. MILLS, C. WRIGHT. "The American Business Elite: A Collective Portrait," *Journal of Economic History, Supplement*, V (1945), 20–44.
234. ———. "The Competitive Personality," *Partisan Review*, XIII (1946), 433–41.
235. ———. "The Middle Classes in Middle Sized Cities," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 520–29.
236. ———. *The New Men of Power*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1948.
237. ———. "The Trade Union Leader: A Collective Portrait," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, IX (1945), 158–75.
238. ———. *White Collar*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
239. MINTON, ARTHUR. "A Form of Class Epigraphy," *Social Forces*, XXVIII (1950), 250–62.
240. MONTAGUE, JOEL B., Jr. "Some Aspects of Class, Status, and Power Relations in England," *Social Forces*, XXX (1951), 134–40.
241. ———. "Research Related to Social Class in England," *American Sociological Review*, XVII (1952), 192–96.
242. MOORE, BARRINGTON, JR. "A Comparative Analysis of the Class Struggle," *American Sociological Review*, X (1945), 31–37.
243. ———. "The Relation between Social Stratification and Social Control," *Sociometry*, V (1942), 230–50.
244. MOORE, WILBERT E. "Sociological Aspects of American Socialist Theory and Practice," in *Socialism and American Life*, I, 523–36, ed. DONALD DREW EGBERT and STOW PERSONS. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.
245. MOTZ, ANNABELLE B. "Conceptions of Marital Roles by Status Groups," *Marriage and Family Living*, XII (1950), 136–62.
246. MUELLER, J. H. and K. H., "Socio-economic Background of Women Students at Indiana University," *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, IX (1949), 321–29.
247. MUKHERJEE, RAMKRISHNA. "Economic Structure of Rural Bengal: A Survey of Six Villages," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 660–72.
248. ———. "The Economic Structure and Social Life in Six Villages of Bengal," *ibid.*, XIV (1949), 415–25.
249. MULLIGAN, RAYMOND A. "Social Mobility and Higher Education," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XV (1952), 476–87.
250. ———. "Socio-economic Background and College Enrollment," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (1951), 188–96.
251. MURRAY, WALTER I. "The Concept of Social Class and Its Implications for Teachers," *Journal of Negro Education*, XX (1951), 16–21.
252. ———. "The I.Q. and Social Class in the Negro Caste," *Southwestern Journal*, IV (1949), 187–201.
253. ———. "Measuring the Social Class Status of Negro Children in the Elementary and High School," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXV (1951), 102–11.
254. ———. "The Performance of Negro Children of Different Social Class Status on Specific Intelligence-Test Items," *Southwestern Journal*, V (1949–50), 48–57.
255. NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER. "The Quarter's Polls—Occupations," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XI (1947–48), 658–64.
256. NEUGARTEN, BERNICE L. "Social Class and Friendship among School Children," *American Journal of Sociology*, LI (1946), 305–13.
257. (NORTH, CECIL C., and HATT, PAUL K.) "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," *Opinion News*, September 1, 1947, pp. 3–13.
258. NORTH, ROBERT C. "The Chinese Communist Elite," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXXVII (1951), 67–75.
259. NYE, IVAN. "Adolescent-Parent Adjustment—Socio-economic Level as a Variable," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (1951), 341–49.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

260. OGBURN, WILLIAM F., and NIMKOFF, MEYER F. *Sociology*, pp. 138–62. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1950.
261. OPPENHEIMER, FRANZ. "Pamela: A Case Study in Status Symbols," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XL (1945), 187–94.
262. OWEN, JOHN E. "Social Distance in England," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXX (1945–46), 460–65.
263. OWSLEY, FRANK LAWRENCE. *Plain Folk of the Old South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1949.
264. OYLER, MERTON D. *Neighborhood Standing and Population Changes in Johnson and Robertson Counties, Kentucky*. (Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station Bull. 523.) Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1948.
265. PAREDES, A. M. "Estudio de las clases sociales," *International Social Science Bulletin*, III (1951), 233. (Abstract.)
266. PARSONS, TALCOTT. "Social Classes and Class Conflict in the Light of Recent Sociological Theory," *American Economic Review*, XXXIX (1949), 16–26.
267. ———. *The Social System*, pp. 132, 172. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.
268. PFAUTZ, HAROLD W., and DUNCAN, OTIS DUDLEY. "A Critical Evaluation of Warner's Work in Community Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, XV (1950), 205–15.
269. POPE, LISTON. "Religion and Class Structure," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLVI (1948), 84–91.
270. POWELL, REED M., "A Comparative Social Class Analysis of San Juan Sur, and Atirro, Costa Rica," *Sociometry*, XIV (1951), 182–202.
271. RATHS, LOUIS E. "Social Class Investigations," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXV (1952), 488–92.
272. REDMON, EDWARD J. "Class Stratification in Industry," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXXIII (1948–49), 212–17.
273. ROGOFF, NATALIE. "Recent Trends in Urban Occupational Mobility," in *Reader in Urban Sociology*, ed. PAUL K. HATT and ALBERT J. REISS, Jr., pp. 406–20. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.
274. ———. "Les Recherches américaines sur la mobilité sociale," *Population*, IV (1950), 669–88.
275. ROSENBERG, MORRIS. "The Social Roots of Formalism," *Journal of Social Issues*, V (1949), 14–23.
276. ROSENFELD, EVA. "Social Stratification in a 'Classless' Society," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (1951), 766–74.
277. Ross, R. G. "Elites and the Methodology of Politics," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XVI (1952), 27–32. (Review article.)
278. ROTH, JULIUS, and PECK, ROBERT F. "Social Class and Social Mobility Factors Related to Marital Adjustment," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (1951), 478–87.
279. RUBIN, MORTON. *Plantation County*, pp. 88–107. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951.
280. RUESCH, J. "Social Technique, Social Status, and Social Change in Illness," in *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, ed. CLYDE KLUCKHOHN and HENRY A. MURRAY, pp. 117–30. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
281. RUESCH, J., *et al. Chronic Disease and Psychological Invalidism*. (Psychosomatic Medicine Monographs.) New York: Paul Hoeber, 1946.
282. RUESCH, J.; JACOBSON, A.; and LOEB, M. B. "Acculturation and Illness," *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, No. 292, Vol. LXII (1948).
283. SAENGER, GERHART H. "Social Status and Political Behavior," *American Journal of Sociology*, LI (1945), 103–13.
284. SCHNEIDER, JOSEPH. "Social Origin and Fame: The United States and England," *American Sociological Review*, X (1945), 52–60.
285. SCHUESSLER, K. F. "Social Background and Musical Taste," *American Sociological Review*, XIII (1948), 330–35.
286. SCHULMAN, M. J., and HAVIGHURST, R. J. "Relations between Ability and Social Status in a Midwestern Community. IV. Size of Vocabulary," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVIII (1947), 437–42.
287. SCHUMPETER, JOSEPH A. *Imperialism and Social Classes*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1951.
288. SEEMAN, MELVIN. "Inter-university Summer Research Seminar on Status and Stratification," *Social Science Research Council Items*, V (1951), 42.
289. SHILS, EDWARD. *The Present State of Amer-*

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

ican Sociology, pp. 13–16. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1948.

290. SILBERMAN, LEO, and SPICE, BETTY. *Colour and Class in Six Liverpool Schools*. Liverpool: University Press, 1950.
291. SIMS, V. M. *Manual for SCI Occupational Rating Scale*. Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Co., 1952.
292. ———. "The Social Class Affiliation of a Group of Public School Teachers," *School Review*, LIX (1951), 331–38.
293. ———. "Social Class Affiliation of Students in a Southern State University," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXXII (1950), 163–75.
294. ———. "Some Correlates of Social Class Identification among High-School and College Students," *School Review*, LX (1952), 160–63.
295. SJOBERG, GIDEON. "Are Social Classes in America Becoming More Rigid," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (1951), 775–83.
296. SMITH, BENJAMIN F. "Wishes of Negro High School Seniors and Social Class Status," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXV (1952), 466–75.
297. SMITH, HENRY P. "Study in the Selective Character of American Secondary Education: A. Participation in School Activities as Conditioned by Socio-economic Status and Other Factors," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVI (1945), 229–46.
298. SOROKIN, P. A. *Society, Culture, and Personality*, pp. 256–95. New York: Harper & Bros., 1947.
299. ———. "War and Post-war Changes in Social Stratifications of the Euro-American Population," *American Sociological Review*, X (1945), 294–303.
300. SOWER, CHRISTOPHER. "Social Stratification in Suburban Communities," *Sociometry*, XI (1948), 235–43.
301. STENDLER, CELIA BURNS. *Children of Brasstown*. (University of Illinois Bull., Vol. 46, No. 59.) Urbana: Bureau of Research and Service of the College of Education, 1949.
302. STEWART, D. D., and CHAMBERS, R. P. "Status Background of the Veteran College Students," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXXV (1950–51), 12–21.
303. SYKES, GRESHAM M. "The Differential Distribution of Community Knowledge," *Social Forces*, XXIX (1951), 376–82.
304. TAYLOR, O. H. "Schumpeter and Marx: Imperialism and Social Classes in the Schumpeterian System," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, LXV (1951), 525–55. (Review article.)
305. THRUPP, SYLVIA L. *The Merchant Class of Medieval London*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
306. TOMASIC, D. "The Structure of Balkan Society," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII (1946), 132–40.
307. TREUDLEY, M. B. "An Ethnic Group's View of the American Middle Class," *American Sociological Review*, XI (1946), 715–24.
308. TUCKMAN, JACOB. "Social Status of Occupations in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, I (1947), 71–74.
309. TUMIN, M. M. *Caste in a Peasant Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.
310. ———. "Reciprocity and Stability of Caste in Guatemala," *American Sociological Review*, XIV (1949), 17–25.
311. TURNBULL, W. W. "Socio-economic Status and Predictive Test Scores," *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, V (1951), 145–49.
312. VOGT, E. Z. "Social Stratification in the Rural Middle West: A Structural Analysis," *Rural Sociology*, XII (1947), 364–75.
313. WANCE, WILLIAM, and BUTLER, RICHARD. "The Effect of Industrial Changes on Occupational 'Inheritance' in Four Pennsylvania Communities," *Social Forces*, XXVII (1948), 158–62.
314. WARNER, W. LLOYD. "A Methodological Note," in *Black Metropolis*, by ST. CLAIR DRAKE and HORACE R. CAYTON, pp. 769–82. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1945.
315. ———. "A Methodology for the Study of Social Class," in *Social Structure*, ed. MEYER FORTES. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.
316. WARNER, W. L., and ASSOCIATES. *Democracy in Jonesville*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949.
317. WARNER, W. LLOYD; MEEKER, MARCHIA; and EELLS, KENNETH. *Social Class in America*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1949.
318. WARNER, W. LLOYD, and HENRY, WILLIAM E. "The Radio Daytime Serial: A Symbolic Analysis," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, XXXVII (1948), 3–72.

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

319. WARNER, W. LLOYD, and LOW, J. O. *The Social System of the Modern Factory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.
320. WARNER, W. L.; MEEKER, M. L.; and WECKLER, N. L. "Methods of Determining Social Status," in *Adolescent Character and Personality*, by R. J. HAVIGHURST and HILDA TABA, pp. 226–32. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.
321. WARNER, W. LLOYD, and SROLE, LEO. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
322. WECKLER, NORA L. "Social Class and School Adjustment in Relation to Character Reputation," in *Adolescent Character and Personality*, by R. J. HAVIGHURST and HILDA TABA, pp. 47–61. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.
323. WELCH, M. K. "The Ranking of Occupations on the Basis of Social Status," *Occupations*, XXVII (1950), 237–41.
324. WEST, JAMES (pseudo.). *Plainville, U.S.A.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
325. WHEELER, WAYNE. *Social Stratification in a Plains Community*. Minneapolis: Wayne Wheeler, 1949.
326. WHYTE, WILLIAM F. "The Social Structure of the Restaurant," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV (1949), 302–10.
327. WIESE, LEOPOLD VON. *Gesellschaftliche Stände und Klassen*. Bern: A Francke AG. Verlag, 1950.
328. WILLIAMS, ROBIN M., JR. *American Society: A Sociological Interpretation*, pp. 78–135. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.
329. WOLPERT, J. F. "Notes on the American Intelligentsia," *Partisan Review*, XIV (1947), 472–85.
330. WORMUTH, FRANCIS D. *Class Struggle*. ("Indiana University Publications, Social Science Series," No. 4.) Bloomington: Indiana University Bookstore, 1946.
331. WRIGHT, DAVID MCCORD. "The Economics of a Classless Society," *American Economic Review*, XXXIX (1949), 27–36.
332. WUNDERLICH, FRIEDA. "Fascism and the German Middle Class," *Antioch Review*, V (1945), 56–67.
333. UNSIGNED. "A Sociologist Looks at an American Community, Rockford, Illinois," *Life*, XXVIII (September 12, 1949), 108–19.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

This content downloaded from 128.059.222.107 on September 03, 2019 04:08:36 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).